



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/716,314

11/18/2003

John M. Stewart

P26,473-A USA

7296

23307 7590 07/08/2008  
SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER, LLP  
1101 MARKET STREET  
SUITE 2600  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER

ROOKE, AGNES BEATA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1656

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/08/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/716,314	<b>Applicant(s)</b> STEWART ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> AGNES B. ROOKE	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) AGNES B. ROOKE. (3) MARC S. SEGAL.  
(2) KATHLEEN KERR BRAGDON. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Burcherl (1968) and Ellis and Krayner (1955).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During the interview, a potential amendment to overcome the written description and enablement rejection was discussed, particularly in reference to a "fragment" of the polypeptide in claim 1. Further, potential language including a "purified" polypeptide was suggested to overcome the prior art rejection.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Kathleen Kerr Bragdon/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required